

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCO United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	,	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,321	04/19/2004		Craig A. Branch	026746.101-US01	1066
26853 7590 10/09/2007 COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP				EXAMINER	
ATTN: PATEN	T DOCKETING	AT 337		LAMPRECHT, JOEL	
1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2401		N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3737	
					•
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		*	•	10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/826,321	BRANCH ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Joel M. Lamprecht	3737		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app		correspondence address		
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 M.</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	vn from consideration. r election requirement.			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachmen			·		
1) Notic 2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5] Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date		

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome all the rejections of the current application. Applicant's arguments with respect to the double patenting rejections have been accepted and the double patenting rejections have been withdrawn.

Applicant has referenced their specification, citing that their definition of holder is not taught by the Hoult reference. The examiner disagrees. The Hoult fabric bag holder is adjoined to the bore of the magnet through electrically connecting straps to the conductive layer, which surrounds the bore magnet (Figure 8). This holder is then configured to form a substantially complete RF shield when the bag is adjoined to the magnet, which comprises a layer for RF shielding (Col 9 line 39-Col 10 Line 36). The shield is substantially complete for the purposes of the Hoult et al patent, where substantially is defined by "an ample and satisfying amount" according to Merriam-Webster. With respect to the argument that one of ordinary skill in the art it is appreciated that while the word "magnetic" does not always imply radio frequency shielding, the Palkovich patent in question contains embodiments which in fact provide shielding for an MR system which uses electromagnetic force (Abstract and introduction) which would encompass the RF spectrum as it is a portion of the electromagnetic spectrum.

Application/Control Number: 10/826,321 Page 3

Art Unit: 3737

1.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoult et al. '278 (US Patent 5,735,278). Hoult et al. teach a system for providing RF shielding comprising: a holder or canopy comprising holder-RF shielding (see Col 10, Line 15-50). Element 72 discloses a protective covering and layer 71 of Figure 8 discloses a magnet comprising magnet-RF-shielding (Col 10 Line 15-24, and also Col 10 Line 36-44). The combination of the holder-RF-shielding and the magnet-RF-shielding to form a substantially complete RF shield. The entirety of the holder comprises RF shielding and therefore inherently the bottom and canopy would comprise RF shielding.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoult et a1.'278 (US Patent No. 5,735,278) in view of Palkovich et a1.'217 (US Patent No. 5,012,217). Hoult et al.'278 teach a system for providing RF shielding comprising: a holder or canopy comprising holder-RF-shielding (see col. 10, lines 15-50; and particularly referring to element 72 or electrically conductive fabric bag; note that as

Application/Control Number: 10/826,321

Art Unit: 3737

evidenced by the Merriam-Webster definitions a canopy is a protective covering); and a magnet comprising magnet-RF-shielding (see layer 71 of Figure 8 which is the magnet RF shielding and see col. 10, lines 15-24) and also see col. 10, lines 36-44; referring to the combining of the holder-RF-shielding and the magnet-RF-shielding to form a substantially complete RF shield. The whole holder includes RF shielding and therefore inherently any of its sub-parts such as the bottom portion would necessarily include RF shielding. Hoult et al. '278 does not explicitly teach that the magnet itself comprises RF shielding, meaning that there is no explicit recitation that the magnet has sufficient RF shielding in that it is a superconducting magnet with an inner diameter having a cryostat made of radio-opaque material. In the same field of endeavor, Palkovich et al. '217 teaches the magnet itself comprises RF shielding, meaning that the magnet has sufficient RF shielding in that it is a superconducting magnet with an inner diameter having a cryostat made of radio-opaque material (see col. 6, lines 4-12 and col. 6, lines 53-61; wherein iron is radio-opaque). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have modified Hoult et a1.'278 and incorporated the teaching of Palkovich et al. '217 of using his particular magnet arrangement with the cryostat in order to increase the RF shielding of the system (see col. 6, lines 53-61 indicating a four-fold increase of the shielding factor).

3. Hoult et al. '278 teach the locomotion of a patient into the imaging volume as indicated in figure 8 having wheels or rollers as indicated. Hoult et al. '278 further teach the use of an RF antenna on the patient support unit as indicated by element 18 in Figure 8 (also see col. 5, lines 20-22).

The opening of the canopy is interpreted as the aperture, which connects the two parts of shielding, the holder and the magnet. It would have been obvious to have combined the Palkovich reference with the RF shielding system of Hoult et al for the purpose of providing a magnet which is not merely associated with RF shielding, but which contains additional shielding for prevention of unnecessary electromagnetic fields during a procedure.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joel M. Lamprecht whose telephone number is (571) 272-3250. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30AM-4PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/826,321

Art Unit: 3737

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JML

9/29/07

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700